

C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

**1:15 p.m., Thursday, April 20, 2006
San Mateo County Transit District Office¹
1250 San Carlos Avenue, Second Floor Auditorium
San Carlos, California**

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) AGENDA

- | | | |
|---|-------------------|---------------|
| 1. Public comment on items not on the Agenda (presentations are customarily limited to 3 minutes). | Cullen/
McAvoy | No materials. |
| 2. Issues from the last C/CAG and CMAQ meetings: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Approved – Changes to the 2006 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for San Mateo County. | Wong | No materials. |
| 3. Approval of the Minutes from March 16, 2006. | Wong | Pages 1-3 |
| 4. Acceptance of project application scoring and approval of recommendation on projects to be submitted to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for funding for Third Cycle Federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) Local Streets and Roads Shortfall. | Wong | Pages 4-6 |
| 5. Joint principles for improvements on El Camino Real (Between California Department of Transportation and C/CAG). | Napier | Pages 7-8 |
| 6. Measure A Update (Strategic Plan development). | Hurley | Oral Report |
| 7. C/CAG Budget | Napier | Pages 9-11 |
| 8. Member Reports. | Cullen/
McAvoy | |

¹ For public transit access use SamTrans Bus lines 390, 391, 292, KX, PX, RX, or take CalTrain to the San Carlos Station and walk two blocks up San Carlos Avenue. Driving directions: From Route 101 take the Holly Street (west) exit. Two blocks past El Camino Real go left on Walnut. The entrance to the parking lot is at the end of the block on the left, immediately before the ramp that goes under the building. Enter the parking lot by driving between the buildings and making a left into the elevated lot. Follow the signs up to the levels for public parking.

**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)
FOR THE
CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (CMP)**

March 16, 2006

MINUTES

The one hundred fifty-eighth (158th) meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was held in the SamTrans Offices, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, Bacciocco Auditorium. Geoffrey Kline called the meeting to order at 1:19 p.m. on Thursday, March 16, 2006.

TAC members attending the meeting were:

Neil Cullen - San Mateo County Engineer (Co-Chair)

Ian McAvoy - SamTrans/JPB (Co-Chair)

Ray Davis - Belmont

Rick Mao - Colma

Meg Monroe - Burlingame

Parviz Mokhtari - San Carlos

Liz Cullinan - San Carlos

Rubin Niño - Menlo Park

Mo Sharma - Daly City

Tatum Mothershead - Daly City

Mark Duino - San Mateo County

Jon Lynch - Redwood City

Fernando Bravo - East Palo Alto

Ray Razavi - South San Francisco

Rick Mao - Colma

Duncan Jones - Atherton

Van Ocampo - Pacifica

Randy Breault - Brisbane

Geoff Kline - C/CAG

Sandy Wong - C/CAG

Joe Hurley - SMCTA

Larry Patterson - San Mateo

Others attending the meeting were:

Richard Napier, Walter Martone, Nancy Blair, Tom Madalena - C/CAG

Brian Lee - San Mateo County Public Works

Zachary Chop, Beth Thomas - Caltrans

Paul Krupka - Kimley-Horn Associates

Jim Bigelow - CMAQ

1. Public comment on items not on the agenda.

Geoff Kline welcomed the two new TAC members appointed by C/CAG in March 2005. They are Sandy Wong, C/CAG staff, and Randy Breault, Brisbane Public Works.

Walter Martone presented a cake to Geoff Kline to congratulate his upcoming retirement. This was the 158th TAC meeting. Geoff has been a TAC member since its inception. After Geoff retires, Parviz Mokhtari will be the longest standing member.

2. Issues from the last C/CAG and CMAQ meetings.

As shown on Agenda.

3. Approval of the Minutes from January 19, 2006.

Approved.

4. Local Streets and Roads application/scoring update.

Geoff Kline updated the committee that the call for project has been sent out. Deadline to submit applications is April 7, 2006 at 4:00 pm. A workshop on this program will immediately follow this meeting.

5. Joint principles for improvements on El Camino Real (between Caltrans and C/CAG).

Richard Napier, Executive Director of C/CAG, presented the Joint Principles for Improvements on El Camino Real between Caltrans and C/CAG. Richard stated that having these principles in place will help jurisdictions in their future decision on El Camino Real corridor planning. TAC members were concerned about the preservation of through capacity versus through lanes. Members suggested preserving capacity is more important than the number of through lanes. Another suggestion was to obtain Caltrans' agreement on allowable design features such as minimum lane width.

In the interest of time, TAC members asked that this item be brought back at the next meeting.

6. California Transportation Infrastructure Bond Update.

There was no significant report on this item. As reported by the media, the infrastructure bond will not go to the voters in June.

7. Measure A Update (Strategic Plan development).

Joe Hurley, Director of San Mateo County Transportation Authority, presented an update on the development of Measure A Strategic Plan. Joe highlighted the goals of the Strategic Plan, the guiding principles to be used in developing it, the implementation guidelines, and a list of Project Sponsors and Stakeholders. Joe also listed the countywide and regional planning documents with which this Strategic Plan will be consistent. Funding criteria is one of the important elements to be developed as part of the Strategic Plan. The draft funding criteria will be submitted to the TA Board in April as information, and then it will be presented to this committee for input. The draft Strategic Plan is scheduled for October 2006 and Final will be in December 2006.

8. Response to comments on Draft Traffic Impact Analysis policy.

At the December 2005 C/CAG Board meeting, the Board directed staff to circulate the Draft Traffic Impact Analysis policy to all 21 jurisdictions for comments. Since then, comments were received from the cities of Menlo Park and Redwood City. The Subcommittee met and addressed those comments and made changes to the draft policy. Sandy Wong presented the recommended final policy. TAC members approved the recommendation to be forwarded to CMAQ.

9. Replacement of CMP TAC Secretary.

Geoff Kline stated that due to his upcoming retirement, it is recommended that Sandy Wong be the Secretary of this TAC. TAC members approved the recommendation.

10. Member Reports.

Rich Napier congratulated Geoff Kline on his retirement and thanked him for his contribution to C/CAG.

The meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: April 20, 2006
To: CMP Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
From: Sandy Wong
Subject: Acceptance of project application scoring and approval of recommendation on projects to be submitted to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for funding for Third Cycle Federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) Local Streets and Roads Shortfall.

(For further information or questions contact Sandy Wong at 599-1409)

RECOMMENDATION

That the TAC accept the project application scoring and approve the recommendation on projects to be submitted to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for funding for Third Cycle Federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) Local Streets and Roads Shortfall.

All projects are subjected to reviewed by MTC staff. If a project recommended for funding is deemed not eligible by the MTC, funding for that project will be awarded to the next project with the highest score.

FISCAL IMPACT

The Third Cycle Federal funding target provided by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) was based on factors such as population, lane mileage, arterial/collector maintenance shortfalls, and jurisdiction's performance in managing its pavement needs. San Mateo County's target is \$5,680,000 for the Third Cycle, which includes FY 2007/08 and 2008/09. MTC has agreed that funds may be advanced and programmed in FY 2006/07, if project sponsor can demonstrate ability to meet the latest project delivery guidelines. Adoption of this program will not affect the C/CAG budget.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Funding will come from the Federal Surface Transportation Program (STP).

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

On March 9 2006, C/CAG Board approved the application and scoring process for the Third Cycle STP local streets and roads shortfall program. A call for project was issued, resulting in 49 project applications, totaling \$14,000,000 in funds requested from 17 jurisdictions.

A Subcommittee of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was assembled with volunteers consisting of Brian Lee, Larry Patterson, Mo Sharma, Parviz Mokhtari, Van Ocampo, and Sandy Wong. This Subcommittee applied the C/CAG adopted scoring criteria and ranked all the project applications. Ranking results are shown in the attachment.

As stated in the adopted program guidelines, no jurisdiction will be awarded more than a maximum of \$1 million of total Federal funds. Both the City of San Mateo and City of Pacifica have projects ranked above the funding cut-off line totaling more than \$1 million in Federal funds. Therefore, their respective lowest ranking projects were dropped by the Subcommittee. At the request of the City of Pacifica, its third highest ranking project was removed instead.

The County of San Mateo's Bay Road Resurfacing project is being recommended for \$250,000 Federal funds. However, this segment of Bay Road is currently not shown on the Federal Functional Classification (FCC). The County has been in contact with Caltrans staff who believe that's an error. Caltrans is in the process of correcting that error. A project cannot receive Federal funds from this program if it's not on the FCC.

Projects with tie score was further ranked by cost/benefit ratio.

ATTACHMENT

- Third Cycle Local Streets & Roads Project Application Scoring Funding Recommendation.

Third Cycle Local Streets and Roads Project Application Scoring and Funding Recommendation

ID	Sponsor	Description	Total Project \$	\$ Requested	\$ Awarded	Total Score	Cumulative Funds Requested	
Projects Recommended for Funding:								
147	Pacifica	Palmetto Ave. rehab	\$810,000	\$405,000	\$405,000	63.00	405,000	
116	Menlo Park	Sand Hill Rd. Resurfacing	\$1,414,000	\$707,000	\$707,000	59.50	1,112,000	
112	Redwood City	Bay Rd & Florence Street	\$600,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	57.90	1,412,000	
129	Daly City	East Market St. Resurfacing	\$725,000	\$350,000	\$350,000	57.90	1,762,000	
131	Atherton	Valparaiso Ave. Overlay (phase 2)	\$942,489	\$470,000	\$470,000	57.00	2,232,000	
144	Pacifica	Sharp Park Rd rehab	\$330,000	\$165,000	\$165,000	55.80	2,397,000	
101	Burlingame	Calif Dr Resurfacing	\$207,000	\$103,000	\$103,000	53.40	2,500,000	
113	Redwood City	Alameda de las Pulgas Overlay	\$1,200,000	\$600,000	\$600,000	53.10	3,100,000	
123	San Mateo	J. Hart Clinton Rehab	\$1,150,000	\$575,000	\$575,000	52.80	3,675,000	
146	Pacifica	Monterey Rd. rehab	\$268,000	\$134,000	\$134,000	52.50	3,675,000	Exceeds Maximum
145	Pacifica	Terra Nova Blvd rehab	\$350,000	\$175,000	\$175,000	51.50	3,850,000	
124	San Mateo	Poplar Ave. Rehab	\$650,000	\$325,000	\$325,000	51.40	4,175,000	
127	Foster City	Foster City Blvd Resurfacing	\$675,000	\$337,500	\$337,000	51.00	4,512,000	
143	Pacifica	Oddstadd Blvd rehab	\$300,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	50.80	4,662,000	
133	County (fed sys?)	Bay Road Resurfacing	\$500,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	50.40	4,912,000	
122	San Carlos	Alameda de las Pulgas Rehab	\$315,000	\$220,500	\$220,000	50.00	5,132,000	
103	Burlingame	Hillside Dr Resurfacing	\$143,000	\$72,000	\$72,000	49.80	5,204,000	
125	San Mateo	San Mateo Downtown St. Rehab	\$650,000	\$325,000	\$325,000	48.40	5,204,000	Exceeds Maximum
102	Burlingame	Rollins Rd Resurfacing	\$206,000	\$103,000	\$103,000	48.20	5,307,000	
117	Menlo Park	Oak Grove Ave. Resurfacing	\$219,000	\$109,000	\$109,000	47.00	5,416,000	
126	Foster City	Shell Blvd Resurfacing	\$280,000	\$140,000	\$140,000	46.80	5,556,000	
138	Millbrae	Skyline Blvd. Pavement repair	\$990,000	\$500,000	\$124,000	45.80	5,680,000	
Projects Not Recommended for Funding due to funding shortage:								
120	Menlo Park	Chilco Street Resurfacing	\$372,000	\$186,000		46.40		
130	Daly City	King Drive Resurfacing	\$625,000	\$500,000		46.00		
121	San Carlos	Holly Street Rehab	\$79,000	\$55,300		45.30		
142	Woodside	Old La Honda & Kings Mtn Rd rehab	\$530,000	\$265,000		44.70		
118	Menlo Park	Menlo Ave. Resurfacing	\$215,000	\$107,000		44.00		
134	County	Broadmoor Resurfacing	\$250,000	\$125,000		44.00		
104	Burlingame	Easton Dr Resurfacing	\$75,000	\$37,000		43.60		
105	Burlingame	Gilbreth Rd Resurfacing	\$130,000	\$65,000		43.60		
114	Redwood City	Roosevelt Ave. Overlay	\$340,000	\$170,000		43.00		
119	Menlo Park	Bay Road Resurfacing	\$369,000	\$185,000		43.00		
136	County	Canada Rd. Resurfacing	\$600,000	\$300,000		43.00		
106	Burlingame	Howard Av Resurfacing	\$250,000	\$127,000		42.60		
132	Burlingame	Barroilhet Ave. Resurfacing	\$188,000	\$94,000		42.00		
148	Colma	Hillside Blvd. Resurfacing	\$1,550,000	\$930,000		41.60		
115	Redwood City	Jefferson Ave. Overlay	\$400,000	\$170,000		41.30		
110	SSF	So. Airport Blvd Resurfacing	\$216,000	\$162,000		41.20		
135	County	San Mateo Highlands Resurfacing	\$600,000	\$300,000		40.00		
109	SSF (Fed sys?)	Produce Ave Resurfacing	\$291,000	\$218,250		39.60		
128	Daly City	Junipero Serra Blvd Rehab	\$1,075,000	\$850,000		38.50		
108	SSF	So. Spruce Ave Resurfacing	\$127,500	\$170,000		37.60		
111	SSF	Evergreen Ave Resurfacing	\$420,000	\$315,000		36.60		
107	Brisbane	Bayshore Blvd Rehab Phase 3	\$450,000	\$398,000		35.00		
137	Millbrae	Larkspur Dr. pavement reconst	\$650,000	\$500,000		33.20		
141	Belmont	Marsten Ave overlay	\$231,000	\$204,000		22.40		
140	Belmont	Carlmont & Harbor overlay	\$302,000	\$267,000		21.40		
Projects not scored by the Subcommittee:					Reasons:			
139	Belmont	Cipriani, Halmark, Harbor, Hastings, Notre Da	\$314,000	\$278,000	Slurry Seal Not eligible.			
149	Half Moon Bay	Hwy 92 & Main Street	\$16,500,000	\$600,000	Funding vs. project schedule Conflict			
GRAND TOTAL:			\$40,073,989	\$14,094,550				

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: April 20, 2006
To: CMP Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
From: Richard Napier, Executive Director
Subject: Receive the Joint Principles for Improvements on El Camino Real between California Department of Transportation (Department) and City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG)

(For further information or questions contact Richard Napier, 599-1420)

That the TAC receive the Joint Principles for Improvements on El Camino Real between California Department of Transportation (Department) and City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG).

At the March 16, 2006, this item was introduced to the TAC. Concerns were expressed regarding the need to preserve through capacity in the El Camino Real corridor. Based on input received, the Joint Principles have been revised as shown in the attached. Per TAC members' request, this item will be discussed at the April 20, 2006 meeting.

ATTACHMENT

- Revised "Joint Principles for Improvements on El Camino Real between California Department of Transportation (Department) and City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG).

**CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (DEPARTMENT)
AND CITY/ COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
OF SAN MATEO COUNTY (C/CAG)
JOINT PRINCIPLES FOR IMPROVEMENTS ON EL CAMINO REAL**

El Camino Real in San Mateo County is a *major* thoroughfare that connects *several* downtowns/ communities in the County. El Camino Real (ECR) corridor provides an opportunity for improved community aesthetics, transit connections, mixed use developments, and housing at various levels of densities. It is critical that the County *and the cities along ECR preserve the transportation role of this important transportation corridor while they* define its unique character *within their community*. A theme could be used along the corridor while preserving the individual character if desired by the Cities and County.

Transportation

Mobility - Seek to optimize mobility on El Camino Real as a thoroughfare connecting communities from county line to county line. This includes mobility for multiple modes of transportation such as public transit, private and commercial vehicles, bicycles and pedestrians.

Through Capacity - Preserve the through lanes capacity on El Camino Real to:

- a- Allow for *future traffic increase due to population* growth and increased housing densities.
- b- Allow for potential enhancements for Express Bus or Bus Rapid Transit.
- c- Facilitate Incident Management.

This means as a minimum:

- a- *No elimination of through lanes.*
- b- *Other actions that reduce capacity on El Camino Real must be evaluated under the C/CAG adopted traffic impact policies for the Congestion Management network. Changes found to have significant unmitigated impacts under that policy will not be permitted.*

This will enable the incremental development of El Camino Real to be consistent and to not preclude the potential development of a long term vision that may include housing and enhanced transit service in the El Camino Real Corridor.

Turning Capacity - Flexible. *This will be* primarily determined by operating characteristics and safety considerations on a location specific basis. *Caltrans will work cooperatively with local Cities and County. Changes must be evaluated using the C/CAG adopted traffic impact policies for the Congestion Management network. Changes found to have significant unmitigated impacts under that policy will not be permitted.*

Transit - Fully consider development of Express Bus or Bus Rapid Transit. Encourage Transit ridership through easy and attractive pedestrian connection between the downtown centers and Caltrain/ Bart stations through design, aesthetics, and special crosswalk treatments.

JOINT PRINCIPALS ON EL CAMINO REAL (Continued)

Land Use

El Camino Real is an opportunity for housing and mixed-use (with housing) developments especially in areas where there is easy access to transit (bus and rail). The needs of existing businesses and other uses along the corridor must be fully considered as planning and development decisions take place. While there are many opportunities for redevelopment, it is recognized that ECR may still provide an appropriate location for

many of the less attractive, though necessary, uses such as auto repair and other repair activities.

Caltrans Flexibility

Caltrans will provide Reasonable flexibility ~~will be provided~~ in the design standards as long as the basic transportation principles in this policy and safety are maintained.

The practices of context sensitivity as discussed in Department policy and guidelines will be used in the application of design standards and project features along the corridor. This includes consideration of safety, operational efficiencies and surrounding environment as well as community's vision and interests. Early consultation concerning the application of context sensitive solutions and regular public involvement will be emphasized.

Caltrans in partnership with C/CAG and the Cities and County will develop a Transportation Corridor Concept Report (TCCR). The objective is to look at the overall corridor to clearly define the existing and future operational, transit, pedestrian and land use compatibility needs of the corridor and to further define the design flexibility that Caltrans can offer within the corridor.

Congestion Management Plan

These principles will be incorporated into the San Mateo County Congestion Management Plan and as such will be a conformity issue.

Richard S. Napier
C/CAG Executive Director

Bijan Sartipi
Caltrans Director District IV

Date

Date

04/14/06	PROJECTED STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES, AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCE							
				FY 2005-06	C/CAG PROJECTION			
	General Fund	Transportation Programs	SMCRP Program	TFCA	NPDES	AVA	AB 1546 Program	Total
BEGINNING BALANCE	\$12,742	\$180,896	\$358,976	\$109,415	\$1,271,399	\$358,710	(\$255)	\$2,291,885
RESERVE BALANCE	\$43,346	\$50,000	\$0	\$0	\$100,903	\$0	\$0	\$194,249
PROJECTED REVENUES								
Interest Earnings	\$1,000	\$6,000	\$10,000	\$4,029	\$6,370	\$2,000	\$0	\$29,399
Member Contribution	\$226,779	\$354,564	\$1,300,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,881,343
Cost Reimbursements	\$0	\$0	\$143,300	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$143,300
ISTEA Funding	\$0	\$390,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$390,000
Grants	\$0	\$100,000	\$3,325	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$103,325
SFIA Traffic Study	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TFCA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,067,098	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,067,098
NPDES	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,379,558	\$0	\$0	\$1,379,558
AVA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$680,000	\$0	\$680,000
Miscellaneous	\$0	\$50,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,632,669	\$2,682,669
MTC Rideshare		\$70,000						\$70,000
PPM		\$67,000						\$67,000
Housing study grants		\$40,000						\$40,000
Total Revenues	\$227,779	\$1,077,564	\$1,456,625	\$1,071,127	\$1,385,928	\$682,000	\$2,632,669	\$8,533,692
TOTAL SOURCES OF FUNDS	\$240,521	\$1,258,460	\$1,815,601	\$1,180,542	\$2,657,327	\$1,040,710	\$2,632,414	\$10,825,577
PROJECTED EXPENDITURES								
Administration Services	\$105,000	\$120,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$146,093	\$12,000	\$15,000	\$418,093
Professional Services	\$100,000	\$470,000	\$130,000	\$41,397	\$192,219	\$0	\$206,891	\$1,140,507
Consulting Services	\$0	\$664,000	\$938,249	\$0	\$965,859	\$0	\$1,237,390	\$3,805,498
Supplies	\$44,500	\$2,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,307	\$0	\$0	\$47,807
Prof. Dues & Memberships	\$1,600	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$26,000	\$0	\$0	\$27,600
Conferences & Meetings	\$4,000	\$3,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,500	\$0	\$0	\$8,500
Publications	\$25,000	\$5,500	\$0	\$0	\$9,999	\$0	\$0	\$40,499
TFCA Distributions	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$950,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$950,000
NPDES Distributions	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
AVA Distributions	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$810,000	\$0	\$810,000
Miscellaneous	\$4,000	\$1,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,000
Total Expenditures	\$284,100	\$1,265,500	\$1,078,249	\$1,001,397	\$1,342,977	\$822,000	\$1,459,281	\$7,253,504
TRANSFERS								
Transfers In	\$45,000	\$0	\$104,000	\$221,666	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$370,666
Transfers Out	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$224,451	\$34,962	\$0	\$104,000	\$363,413
Total Transfers	(\$45,000)	\$0	(\$104,000)	\$2,785	\$34,962	\$0	\$104,000	(\$7,253)
NET CHANGE	(\$11,321)	(\$187,936)	\$482,376	\$66,945	\$7,989	(\$140,000)	\$1,069,388	\$1,287,441
TRANSFER TO RESERVES	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL USE OF FUNDS	\$239,100	\$1,265,500	\$974,249	\$1,004,182	\$1,377,939	\$822,000	\$1,563,281	\$7,246,251
ENDING FUND BALANCE	\$1,421	(\$7,040)	\$841,352	\$176,360	\$1,279,389	\$218,710	\$1,069,133	\$3,579,326
RESERVE FUND BALANCE	\$43,346	\$50,000	\$0	\$0	\$100,903	\$0	\$0	\$194,249
NET INCREASE (Decrease) IN FUND BALANCE	(\$11,321)	(\$187,936)	\$482,376	\$66,945	\$7,989	(\$140,000)	\$1,069,388	\$1,287,441
As of June 30, 2006								

04/14/06	PROJECTED STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES, AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCE							
				FY 2006-07	PROGRAM BUDGET			
	General Fund	Transportation Programs	SMCRP Program	TFCA	NPDES	AVA	AB 1546 Program	Total
BEGINNING BALANCE	\$1,421	(\$7,040)	\$841,352	\$176,360	\$1,279,389	\$218,710	\$1,069,133	\$3,579,326
RESERVE BALANCE	\$43,346	\$50,000	\$0	\$0	\$100,903	\$0	\$0	\$194,249
PROJECTED REVENUES								
Interest Earnings	\$2,000	\$5,000	\$10,000	\$4,029	\$6,000	\$2,000	\$0	\$29,029
Member Contribution	\$238,118	\$372,292	\$1,300,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,910,410
Cost Reimbursements	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
ISTEA Funding	\$0	\$525,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$525,000
Grants	\$0	\$100,000	\$600,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$700,000
SFIA Traffic Study	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TFCA	\$0	\$67,000	\$0	\$1,067,098	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,134,098
NPDES	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,388,456	\$0	\$0	\$1,388,456
AVA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$680,000	\$0	\$680,000
Miscellaneous	\$0	\$100,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,632,669	\$2,732,669
Total Revenues	\$240,118	\$1,239,292	\$1,910,000	\$1,071,127	\$1,394,456	\$682,000	\$2,632,669	\$9,099,662
TOTAL SOURCES OF FUNDS	\$241,539	\$1,232,252	\$2,751,352	\$1,247,487	\$2,673,845	\$900,710	\$3,701,802	\$12,748,988
PROJECTED EXPENDITURES								
Administration Services	\$107,000	\$130,000	\$10,000	\$12,000	\$149,825	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$438,825
Professional Services	\$95,000	\$460,000	\$180,000	\$32,000	\$208,500	\$0	\$116,633	\$1,090,133
Consulting Services	\$0	\$601,000	\$1,900,000	\$0	\$1,046,018	\$0	\$2,501,036	\$6,048,054
Supplies	\$46,500	\$2,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,500	\$0	\$0	\$50,000
Prof. Dues & Memberships	\$1,600	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$34,066	\$0	\$0	\$35,666
Conferences & Meetings	\$4,000	\$3,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,500	\$0	\$0	\$8,500
Publications	\$22,500	\$5,500	\$0	\$0	\$15,000	\$0	\$0	\$43,000
TFCA Distributions	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,075,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,075,000
NPDES Distributions	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
AVA Distributions	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$675,000	\$0	\$675,000
Miscellaneous	\$4,000	\$1,000	\$0	\$0	\$50,000	\$0	\$0	\$55,000
Total Expenditures	\$280,600	\$1,202,500	\$2,090,000	\$1,119,000	\$1,504,409	\$690,000	\$2,632,669	\$9,519,178
TRANSFERS								
Transfers In	\$40,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$40,000
Transfers Out	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,000	\$35,688	\$0	\$0	\$38,688
Total Transfers	(\$40,000)	\$0	\$0	\$3,000	\$35,688	\$0	\$0	(\$1,312)
NET CHANGE	(\$482)	\$36,792	(\$180,000)	(\$50,873)	(\$145,641)	(\$8,000)	\$0	(\$418,204)
TRANSFER TO RESERVES	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL USE OF FUNDS	\$240,600	\$1,202,500	\$2,090,000	\$1,122,000	\$1,540,097	\$690,000	\$2,632,669	\$9,517,866
ENDING FUND BALANCE	\$939	\$29,752	\$661,352	\$125,487	\$1,133,747	\$210,710	\$1,069,133	\$3,231,122
RESERVE FUND BALANCE	\$43,346	\$50,000	\$0	\$0	\$100,903	\$0	\$0	\$194,249
NET INCREASE (Decrease) IN FUND BALANCE	(\$482)	\$36,792	(\$180,000)	(\$50,873)	(\$145,641)	(\$8,000)	\$0	(\$348,204)
As of June 30, 2007								